

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

WAYNE ABRAHAMSON,  
BERGMAN BROTHERS, and  
WAYNE CARLSON,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF  
HOLDREGE, KENNETH  
SLOMINSKY, ERIC TITUS,  
RONALD STERR, TIM WIEBE,  
JEANETTE HARDEN, KIRK  
RILEY, MARK UTTER, and  
DOUGLAS SCOTT LATTE,

Defendants.

**4:05CV3039**

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

---

PHILLIP M. KELLY, as Trustee of  
the bankruptcy estate of DENNIS R.  
DAMROW, together with  
SHERRY DAMROW, as their  
interests may be established,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF  
HOLDREGE, KENNETH  
SLOMINSKY, ERIC TITUS,  
RONALD STERR, TIM WIEBE,  
JEANETTE HARDEN, KIRK  
RILEY, MARK UTTER, and  
DOUGLAS SCOTT LATTE,

Defendants.

**4:05CV3040**

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

DONALD DAMROW,

Plaintiff,

VS.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF  
HOLDREGE, KENNETH  
SLOMINSKY, ERIC TITUS,  
RONALD STERR, TIM WIEBE,  
JEANETTE HARDEN, KIRK  
RILEY, MARK UTTER, and  
DOUGLAS SCOTT LATTEr,

Defendants.

MARTIN DAMROW,

Plaintiff,

VS.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF  
HOLDREGE, KENNETH  
SLOMINSKY, ERIC TITUS,  
RONALD STERR, TIM WIEBE,  
JEANETTE HARDEN, KIRK  
RILEY, MARK UTTER, and  
DOUGLAS SCOTT LATTER,

Defendants.

**4:05CV3041**

# MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

**4:05CV3042**

# MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

DAMROW and DAMROW, a  
General Partnership,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF  
HOLDREGE, KENNETH  
SLOMINSKY, ERIC TITUS,  
RONALD STERR, TIM WIEBE,  
JEANETTE HARDEN, KIRK  
RILEY, MARK UTTER, and  
DOUGLAS SCOTT LATTE,

Defendants.

---

DAMROW FARMS, a  
General Partnership,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF  
HOLDREGE, KENNETH  
SLOMINSKY, ERIC TITUS,  
RONALD STERR, TIM WIEBE,  
JEANETTE HARDEN, KIRK  
RILEY, MARK UTTER, and  
DOUGLAS SCOTT LATTE,

Defendants.

---

**4:05CV3043**

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

**4:05CV3044**

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

I previously entered orders in each of these cases granting motions to dismiss, accompanied by judgments. The plaintiffs in each of these six cases have filed motions to alter or amend the dismissal orders (and, presumably, the judgments) to allow them to file amended complaints. No proposed amended complaints were filed. Upon consideration, I find that the motions should be denied.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The motions to alter or amend the judgment (4:05CV3039, filing 48; 4:05CV3040, filing 49; 4:05CV3041, filing 44; 4:05CV3042, filing 43; 4:05CV3043, filing 46; 4:05CV3044, filing 48) are denied; and
2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to file this memorandum and order in each of the individual cases reflected in the joint caption.

February 15, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

*s/Richard G. Kopf*  
United States District Judge